



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/538,845   | 06/13/2005  | Toshio Nakane        | 1226-110            | 2661             |
| 23117  | 7590        | 12/11/2006           | EXAMINER            |                  |
| NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC<br>901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR<br>ARLINGTON, VA 22203 |             |                      | LISTVOYB, GREGORY   |                  |
|  |             |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
|  |             |                      | 1711                |                  |

DATE MAILED: 12/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/538,845

Applicant(s)

NAKANE ET AL.

Examiner

Gregory Listvoyb

Art Unit

1711

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/05
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

Claims 1- 5, 12-25 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Linstid, III et al (US Patent 6222000), herein Linstid in combination and Furuta et al (US Patent 5612101), herein Furuta.

Linstid discloses amorphous wholly aromatic polyester amide exhibiting optical anisotropy obtained by copolymerizing:

- A 4-hydroxybenzoic acid-15-60%, preferably 20-40%
- B 2-hydroxy-6-naphtoic acid 15-60%, preferably 20-40%
- C 4-aminophenol 5-20%, preferably 10-15%
- D isophthalic acid or its mixture with m-aminophenol 7-15 %, preferably 10-15%
- E terephthalic acid 5-20% , preferably 10-15% (Columns 3-4)

Linstid teaches that his liquid crystal copolymers can be used in a composition with Polyolefins, (such as Polyethylene or modified PE) which have melting point below 230C, meeting the limitation of Claim 1. (Typical T<sub>m</sub> for HDPE is about 140C).

The A/B ratio is always within the range of 0.15 to 4.0. The content of Isophthalic acid is always 35% or higher of content of Terephthalic acid. The content of bending monomer (Isophthalic acid) is 7-15%, meeting the limitation (2) of Claim 1.

Art Unit: 1711

Glass transition temperatures, of the above copolymers are about 150C (Column 6, line 5), whereas melting point  $T_m$  is not observed (Column 5, line 65). ). DSC measurements are made at 20 C/min temperature rising rate (Column 17, line 45).

Regarding Claim 2, Isophthalic acid has 1,3 phenylene skeleton.

Regarding Claims 13, 19 and 25 Linstid discloses that his copolymers are melt-processable below 270C (Column 6, line 5).

Linstid teaches that the above liquid crystal copolymers may be used in combination with polyolefins and modified polyolefins, (Example 26, Column 24 and Column 3, line 10) for production of films, sheets, fibers, multi-layer laminates, blow-molded containers and other articles. (Column 16, line 20). Thus the limitations of Claims 12-22 and 25 are met.

Regarding Claim 23, Linstid does not specify that a polyethylene he discloses for multilayered applications is HDPE. However, such articles as bottles, tanks and containers typically producing from HDPE. HDPE has a significant advantage over LDPE in terms of mechanical strength, which is critical for the above applications.

Linstid does not teach a ratio between the resins in the composition based on the above liquid crystal copolymers, Also, he fails to disclose that polyethylene in blow-

Art Unit: 1711

molded article is high density polyethylene. In addition Linstid does not disclose that his liquid crystal composition can be processed into fuel tank. Hence the attention is directed towards Furuta. Linstid and Furuta are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, utilizing liquid crystal polymers.

Furuta teaches a liquid crystal polyester resin composition film made of a liquid crystal polyester resin composition comprising (A) preferably 70 through 98% by weight of a liquid crystal polyester and (B) preferably 30 through 1% by weight of a thermoplastic resin (polyolefin, modified polyolefin, etc. (Column 10, line 10), by blown film extrusion or by laminating. The above liquid crystal polyester resin composition has an improved behavior in molten state which has been extraordinary in and drawback of the conventional liquid crystal polyesters and is easily molded into a film with excellent mechanical strength heat resistance and gas-barrier properties and gasoline-barrier properties (Abstract).

Furuta discloses that at above ratios liquid crystal polymer forms a continuous phase and other thermoplast forms a disperse phase. With increased content of thermoplast a moldability deteriorates and mechanical strength and barrier properties lowers. (Column10, line 15)

Art Unit: 1711

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skills in the art to combine liquid crystal and thermoplastic resin in order to improve physical properties of a final molded article. In order to obtain excellent mechanical properties, typical for liquid crystal copolymers it is important that liquid crystal polymer forms a continuous phase and other thermoplast forms a disperse phase. When the amount of dispersed phase exceeds 25-30%, two continuous phases formed. In this case values of most important mechanical properties, such as Young modulus, decrease. Therefore, it is important to keep a content of thermoplastic polymer in the composition below 30% wt.

Regarding Claim 23, Furuta discloses that polyethylene in his composition is high density polyethylene (HDPE) (Example 6, column 17).

Since HDPE has much better mechanical properties than LDPE due to its higher crystallinity it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skills in the art to use HDPE for high end applications, such as large blow molded containers.

Regarding Claim 24, Furuta discloses that his composition can be processed into a fuel tank (Comparative Example 6, Column 18).

Since Linstid composition has an exceptional mechanical and barrier properties and ability to be processed by blow molding, it would have been obvious to a person with

Art Unit: 1711

ordinary skills in the art to use a composition based on Linstid copolymers for manufacturing of fuel tanks.

Claims 6-10 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Charbonneau et al (US Patent 4351918), herein Charbonneau in combination with Furuta

Charbonneau discloses liquid crystal copolymer comprising 40% 4-hydroxybenzoic acid, 20% 2-hydroxy-6-naphthoic acid, 20% terephthalic acid, 5% p-phenylenediamine and 20% 2,6 dihydroxyanthraquinone (bending monomer) Glass transition temperature, measured by DSC at temperature rising rate of 20C/min is 122C, whereas distinctive T<sub>m</sub> transition is not observed (Column 17, Example 6). Therefore, limitations (1) to (5) of claim 1 are met.

Regarding Claims 7-10, Charbonneau teaches that terephthalic acid can be completely replaced by isophthalic acid.(which have 1, 3 phenylene skeleton) In this case the ratio of isophthalic acid in D is 100%.

Charbonneau does not teach a composition based on the above copolymer. Hence attention is directed to Furuta. Charbonneau and Furuta are analogous art since they are from the same field of endeavor, utilizing liquid crystal copolymers.

Furuta teaches a liquid crystal polyester resin composition film made of a liquid crystal polyester resin composition comprising (A) preferably 70 through 98% by weight of a liquid crystal polyester and (B) preferably 30 through 1% by weight of a thermoplastic resin (polyolefin, modified polyolefin, etc. (Column 10, line 10)

The above liquid crystal polyester resin composition has an improved behavior in molten state which has been extraordinary in and drawback of the conventional liquid crystal polyesters and is easily molded into a film with excellent mechanical strength heat resistance and gas-barrier properties (Abstract). Furuta discloses that at above ratios liquid crystal polymer forms a continuous phase and other thermoplast forms a disperse phase. With increased content of thermoplast a moldability deteriorates and mechanical strength and barrier properties lowers. (Column10, line 15)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skills in the art to combine liquid crystal and thermoplastic resin in order to improve physical properties of a final molded article. In order to obtain excellent mechanical properties, typical for liquid crystal copolymers it is important that liquid crystal polymer forms a continuous phase and other thermoplast forms a disperse phase. When the amount of dispersed phase exceeds 25-30%, two continuous phases formed. In this case values of most important mechanical properties, such as Young modulus, decrease. Therefore, it is important to keep a content of thermoplastic polymer in the composition below 30% wt.



Art Unit: 1711

In addition, liquid crystal copolymers are very expensive. Partially replacing them with inexpensive polyolefin has a significant economical advantage.

Claim 11 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Linstid and Furuta as applied to claims 6-10 above, and further in view of Hiroshi (JP publication 03-284726).

Charbonneau does not teach that liquid crystal resin contains 1,3 phenylenediamine. Hence attention is directed to Hiroshi. Charbonneau and Hiroshi are analogous art since they are from the same field of endeavor, utilizing liquid crystal copolymers.

Hiroshi discloses a composition based on liquid crystal oriented film comprising dicarboxylic acid and 15 or more weight percent of 1,3-phenylenediamine. This composition has the large tilt angle and good adhesive properties, when combined with a substrate.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skills in the art to use 1,3-phenylenediamine in Charbonneau's liquid crystal and thermoplastic resin composition in order to improve adhesiveness between layers in the composition.

Charbonneau does not teach a composition based on a liquid crystal resin.

Furuta teaches a composition based on liquid crystal polymer and modified polyolefin (see Furuta discussion above).

***Double patenting***

Claims 1-5 and 12-25 provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-14 of copending Application No. 10/525,642 in view of Furuta (see Furuta discussion above).

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the application claim the composition based on the same liquid crystal polymer as in the Application 10/525,642.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory Listvoyb whose telephone number is (571) 272-6105. The examiner can normally be reached on 9am-6pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Seidleck can be reached on (571) 272-1078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1711

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Gregory Listvoyb  
Examiner  
Art Unit 1711

\*\*\*



James J. Seidleck  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 1700